

REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are pending in the application. Claims 1-43 stand rejected.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks hereinbelow.

Drawings:

Enclosed are 7 sheets of formal drawings depicting Figure(s) 1-9b. Please substitute these formal drawings for the informals currently on file in the subject application. There are no substantive changes to the drawings.

Replacement sheets attached.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. 112:

Claim 13 stands rejected as being indefinite because it is unclear whether either limitations before and following the phrase “and/or” are part of the claimed invention. Applicant has determined that the rejection is meant to refer to claim 12, and appropriate amendment has been made.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103:

All of the original claims stand rejected as either anticipated by Tajiri et al. US 6,482,092 (Tajiri) or as obvious over Tajiri in view of one or more of patents to Matsuda et al. (US 6,253,167), Nakamura (US 6,468,162), Tran et al. (US 5,440,108), Forbes et al. (US 2003/0134460), Reinhardt (US 5,598,565), Mizumo et al. (US 6,285,420), Rehkemper et al. (US 6,287,193), Sitrick (US 5,728,960), Peppel (US 6,200,216), Ng (US 5,971,855), and Harada et al. (US 6,213,872).

In order to simplify the issues, all grounds of rejection will be argued together on the basis that the primary reference (Tajiri) does not teach the elements or steps for which it has been cited.

Tajiri does show a pair of linked consoles in Figs. 1 and 5-7. It also describes image data (Fig. 8) and exchanging characters. These are claimed elements of the present invention. However, neither Tajiri nor any of the secondary references disclose developing image sequences based on pairs of interacting, independent characters whose relevant image and other data is obtained from each of a pair of interacting devices. Further, the cited art does not disclose a controller that forms an image sequence displaying pairs of interacting, independent characters.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See MPEP 2143.03. It is well established that, for a proper *prima facie* rejection of a claimed invention on the basis of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, the references relied upon must teach every element of the claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that in view of the above amendments and remarks, that this application is now in condition for allowance, prompt notice of which is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 40,802

Roland R. Schindler II/jrk
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-588-2736
Facsimile: 585-477-1148